

## REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated November 25, 2005. Claims 1 to 11 are in the application, of which Claims 1, 7 and 11 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Before turning to the merits of the Office Action, a few formal matters will be addressed.

First, U.S. Patent 6,755,516 (Hanson), over which all claims were rejected, is not now formally of record in that it was not listed on Form PTO-892 attached to the Office Action. It is respectfully requested for the Examiner to make the Hanson patent formally of record.

Second, in reviewing the application, a typographical error was noted in the Japanese document cited at page 3 of the specification, in that "2001-25308" should have read "2001-253087". As a consequence of this typographical error, an incorrect document was provided with the Information Disclosure Statement dated June 22, 2005. The specification has been amended so as to correct the citation, and a new Information Disclosure Statement accompanies this Amendment, so as to provide a copy of the correct Japanese document. It will be appreciated that this Japanese document corresponds to U.S. Patent 6,375,315 (Steinmetz), which was cited but not applied in the Office Action.

Third, it is noted that the figures of Hanson are largely identical to those of Steinmetz, and the Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to confirm that the rejection has been entered over Hanson, and not Steinmetz.

Turning to the merits of the Office Action, formal objections were lodged against Claims 1, 2 and 8, and a requirement was made to label Figures 9 through 11 as "Prior Art". These matters have been attended to, as requested.

Claims 1, 7 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over the above-cited Hanson patent, and the remaining claims were rejected under § 103(a) over Hanson. The rejections are respectfully traversed. In this regard, although changes have been made to the claims, these changes are intended to improve antecedence for terminology used in the claims, such as the container's "lateral sides". No change in scope was intended, nor is it believed that any change in scope was effected. Accordingly, this should be viewed as a traversal of the rejection, as indicated above.

The invention concerns a liquid container in which a projection is provided on only one lateral side of the pair of lateral sides of the container's body, wherein the projection is guided when the container is mounted to a container holder along an upper end of a guide wall provided in the container holder while the other lateral side is limited by an inner surface of the container holder. It is thus a feature of the invention that only one lateral side is provided with a projection, which is guided along an upper end of a guide wall of the container holder, whereas the other lateral side is limited by an inner surface of the container holder.

On the other hand, the cited patent to Hanson discloses a pair of projections 40 that project outwardly from both lateral sides of ink container 12. This is different from the invention, in which a projection is provided on only one lateral side.

The Office Action took the position that Hanson's engagement feature 42 corresponds to the claimed projection which is provided on only one lateral side. Applicants disagree with this interpretation for at least two reasons. First, Hanson's engagement feature 42 does not guide container 12 as it is being mounted to the container holder; rather, engagement feature 42 is provided for engagement with engagement 48 disposed on the back wall 66 of receiving station 14, as clearly depicted in Figures 7a


through 7c. It is also clear from these figures that it is projection 40, and not engagement feature 42, that guides Hanson's container 12 during insertion.

Second, Hanson's engagement feature 42 is on the wrong wall, in that it is not on a lateral side which connects a leading side and a trailing side of Hanson's container. Rather, Hanson's engagement feature 42 is on a leading side of its container, and not on a lateral side thereof.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that the claims herein define an invention that is neither anticipated nor would have been obvious over the Hanson patent, and allowance of the claims herein is respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office by telephone at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Attorney for Applicants  
Michael K. O'Neill  
Registration No.: 32,622

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3800  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA\_MAIN 109924v1